DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 711 FL 026 489

AUTHOR Hruska, Barbara L.
TITLE Ideologies, Programs, and Practices: Implications for Second Language Learners.
PUB DATE 2000-10-28
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Puerto Rican Studies Association Conference (Amherst, MA, October 28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education Programs; Bilingualism; Critical Theory; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; Elementary School Teachers; English for Special Purposes; *English (Second Language); *Ethnography; Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Interviews; Language Minorities; Limited English Speaking; Participant Observation; *Power Structure; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Spanish Speaking; *Student Placement

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the relationship between bilingual and English monolingual populations in a setting where English monolingualism is the norm for most students and teachers. The power dynamics underlying this relationship influence local meanings and practices related to bilingualism and the instruction of second language learners. Student placement procedures and the implications of this practice for all students are analyzed. Data are drawn from a year-long ethnographic study and a year-long follow-up study at the same site. The theoretical framework that guided the studies is based on the research of Norman Fairclough, who asserted that language is dialectically related to society and not an independent, isolated linguistic system. Fairclough conceptualizes language as a site of social negotiation where language, ideology, and unequal power relations interplay. This is followed by a brief description of the research site, population, data collection, data management, and data analysis. It is concluded that the clustering of English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) and Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) learners into "pull out" programs is more a reflection of unequal power relations than what is necessarily the best educational practice for all concerned. Questions that should always be asked about an educational model include the following: What are the dominant ideologies in any setting? What are the related practices? and Whom do they serve? (Contains 23 references.) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 447 711

FL

IDEOLOGIES, PROGRAMS, AND PRACTICES: IMPLICATIONS FOR SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Barbara Hruska

1

by

BARBARA L. HRUSKA

A paper presented at the Puerto Rican Studies Association Conference
October 28, 2000
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL 028 489

IDEOLOGIES, PROGRAMS, AND PRACTICES: IMPLICATIONS FOR SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Introduction

While many institutional programs and classroom practices are accepted by educators as common sense and typical, they are guided by underlying ideologies which influence the choices made by administrators and practitioners in specific educational settings (Fairclough, 1989; Nieto, 1999). Dominant ideologies are often implicit and are perpetuated by the populations that most benefit from them. These ideologies and their related practices are often sociopolitical in nature and are a result of the power relations in the society at large. When these practices are challenged in educational settings, the ideologies are often revealed and their meanings and implications become explicit.

In this paper I examine the relationship between bilingual and English monolingual populations in a setting where English monolingualism is the norm for most students and teachers. The power dynamics underlying this relationship influence local meanings and practices related to bilingualism and the instruction of second language learners. Student placement procedures and the implications of this practice for all students are analyzed. Data are drawn from a year long ethnographic study (Hruska, 1999) and a year-long follow-up study at the same site. The theoretical framework that guided the studies is presented in the next section. This is followed by a brief description of the research site, population, data collection, data management, and data analysis. The remainder of the report is devoted to a description and interpretation of data.

Theoretical Framework

Norman Fairclough (1989) views language as dialectically related to society rather than as an isolated, independent linguistic system. From this perspective, language use is seen as socially, rather than individually, determined. Fairclough conceptualizes language as a site of social negotiation and is particularly interested in the relationship of language, ideology, and unequal relations of power. It is through language use, Fairclough proposes, that power relations are expressed, maintained, challenged, resisted, and changed. What is said, who says what to whom,

who participates, who does not, the conventions that limit this participation, how participants are positioned, and the meanings that are constructed during this interaction are all significant in defining power struggles and their underlying ideologies. Fairclough defines ideology as an "implicit philosophy" which governs practice and is often a taken for granted assumption linked to common sense. When ideologies and related practices are considered common sense, they become legitimated as the accepted way of conducting oneself and appear to lose their ideological character.

This process of naturalization is in large part determined by who exercises power. The struggle over practices, meanings, identities, and relationships, says Fairclough, is the struggle over the maintenance or establishment of a dominant common sense. The less visible an ideology is, the more embedded in discourse and practice, the more effective it becomes. However, when ". . . one becomes aware that a particular aspect of common sense is sustaining power inequalities at one's own expense, it ceases to be common sense and may cease to have the capacity to sustain power inequalities" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 85). That is, dominant common sense ideologies are not fixed. They can be challenged and changed: ". . . there is a constant endeavor on the part of those who have power to try and impose an ideological common sense which holds true for everyone . . . there is always to *some* degree ideological diversity, and indeed, conflict and struggle so that ideological uniformity is never completely achieved" (p. 86). Ideological diversity sets limits on ideological common sense.

Fairclough proposes that the source of ideological diversity is not the individual, but results from the differences in positioning and interests among different social groups who enter into power relationships with each other. Institutions are primary domains in which such social struggles occur. Challenge to these naturalized dominant ideologies and practices comes when they are contested or resisted with ideological perspectives and practices held by opposing factions. It is at these interfaces, Fairclough predicts, that creativity and change are most likely to flourish if the social circumstance enables it. In order for this change to occur it is necessary to identify how local common sense practices are ideologically shaped by power relations both within and beyond the

immediate context. The process of analysis and conscious awareness of these power dynamics is the first step toward such transformation.

This theoretical framework is useful for identifying and analyzing the ideologies and practices that impact bilingual students in an English dominant environment where unequal relations of power exist. The following four questions based on this framework guided this study:

1) How are the power relationships between majority and minority languages and their speakers reflected in local ideologies about Spanish/English bilingualism (Fairclough, 1989; Glick, 1987; Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996; Nieto, 1992)?

2) How do these relationships and underlying ideologies affect local structures such as programs and practices (Taylor, 1987)?

3) How do these local structures affect second language learners' access to language, interaction, knowledge, identity, culture, social relationships and power (Cummins, 1996; Hruska, 1999)?

4) What happens when local practices are challenged and the needs of second language learners are prioritized (Nieto, 1999)?

Research Site and Population

The setting for this study was a public elementary school in a New England college town. Access and consent to conduct the studies were procured without difficulty. Pseudonyms for the school, teachers, and students are used throughout the study with the exception of my own name.

The school, River Valley Elementary, had approximately 380 students grades K-6 in 18 self-contained classrooms. The ethnicity of the students as reported by the school district was 73% of European descent, 9% African, 6% Asian, 11% Hispanic and .2% Native American (terminology used in the report). Approximately 30-40 students at the school were dominant in a language other than English and received English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction. Twenty of these students were Spanish dominant and voluntarily participated in the Spanish Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) program at the site. In this model children were taught academic subjects in Spanish, their dominant language, while they were learning English. As their English proficiency increased and they were able to complete grade level work in English, they were transitioned from a bilingual to an all English mainstream program. The institutional designation for these children was "ESL students." The children who attended the TBE program were often

referred to as "TBE students" even though they also received ESL instruction.

Both the ESL and TBE classes at this site were "pull-out" programs which meant that all the children in the school were assigned to an English dominant classroom where most native English speaking children spent the entire day. ESL and TBE students usually left, or were pulled out, of their classrooms for 45 minutes to 3 hours daily to attend ESL and TBE classes. At the time of the study, ESL instruction was provided by one teacher to all ESL students grades K-6. TBE instruction was provided to students K-6 by a Spanish bilingual teacher and an aide. For most ESL/TBE students this meant that they experienced a day which involved moving back and forth from their grade-level classrooms to the TBE and/or ESL rooms. This fragmented schedule had been a concern of some classroom teachers, parents, and the children themselves. It made coordination among programs difficult and resulted in the children sometimes feeling disconnected from the mainstream community. In some cases the children responded by not wanting to be in their grade-level classrooms, in other cases they were reluctant to leave them. These issues of frequent transitions and social integration were the impetus for initiating this research.

The original study concentrated on a single kindergarten classroom where there were 23 children, six of whom were Spanish dominant and were enrolled in the Spanish TBE program. The analyses from this study included in this report focus on Mrs. Ryan, the kindergarten teacher; Sra. García, the Spanish TBE teacher; and myself, the ESL teacher.

Mrs. Ryan was an African American, native English speaking, elementary teacher with over 20 years of experience at the primary level. She held a master's degree in multicultural education and was committed to social justice pedagogy. She had participated in a French language immersion program as an elementary student and was learning beginning Spanish vocabulary with her class. She had been at the research site for over 20 years.

Sra. García was the Puerto Rican Spanish TBE teacher. She had professional proficiency in both Spanish and English and held a master's degree in bilingual education. With the assistance of a bilingual aide she taught Spanish language arts and math to the 15-20 Spanish dominant

children grades K-6 enrolled in the Spanish TBE program. She provided instruction primarily in a separate classroom with the exception of math instruction which sometimes occurred in mainstream classrooms. She had been at the research site for four years.

I was the ESL teacher at the site. I am a White, native English speaker with intermediate language proficiency in Spanish, Danish, and French. I had six years of elementary classroom teaching experience prior to becoming an ESL teacher. I have taught ESL for 12 years. I hold a master's degree and doctorate in ESL. At River Valley School, I taught mixed grade and mixed proficiency ESL pull-out classes primarily in the ESL room for 35-40 ESL students grades K-6. I am a firm believer in bilingual education. I had been at the research site for 10 years.

In addition to these three teachers, data was collected from classroom teachers, support teachers, and the building principal during the follow-up study. The full-time teaching staff at River Valley School consisted primarily of White, English dominant veteran teachers, three quarters of whom had been at the site 10 years or longer. Of the 35 teachers, 7 were teachers of color and 5 had bilingual proficiency.

Data Collection

Data were gathered over two academic years (although not two consecutive years) exclusive of a pilot study year. Data sources included field notes, videotapes, audiotaped teacher interviews, informal student interviews, seating charts, notes from parent conferences, notes from faculty meetings, grade level meetings, personal correspondence, and documents. This resulted in 880 pages of handwritten field notes, 40 hours of videotape, 4 hours of audiotaped teacher interviews, 113 seating charts, and 30 documents.

Prolonged engagement (2 years), persistent observation (1-5 observations per week), and triangulation (of data and roles) were utilized to ensure the credibility of the study. Having a variety of data allowed me to triangulate the findings by identifying repeating themes, confirming or negating hypotheses, and searching for negative cases across data sources. In addition to this triangulation of sources, there was a triangulation of roles. I approached the setting both as a

teacher and a researcher. I was able to shift from being an observer, to a participant observer, to a complete participant (Sevigny, 1981). These varying roles afforded a variety of perspectives from which to collect data, some fully involved, others more removed. Multiple data sources and researcher roles brought a depth to data collection and analysis which enriched the interpretive process as well as ensuring credibility.

Data Management and Data Analysis

Like data collection, data management and data analysis continued throughout the studies. Data were reviewed regularly using standard ethnographic analytic techniques (Goetz & Le Compte, 1984; Patton, 1990; Spradley, 1980). Analytic memos were composed weekly and were reviewed at several points during the study. These memos served to identify patterns, themes, questions, and hypotheses. Initial analyses, related to the research questions, involved scanning and indexing the entire corpus of data several times. Data were categorized and organized according to their relevance to the research questions and theoretical framework. Selective coding was conducted on field notes, interviews, videotaped data, and documents. Twenty-five classroom events from the original study representative of whole class, small group, and free play activities were selected and transcribed according to their relevance to the broad research questions and theoretical framework. Twelve microanalysis questions were systematically applied to the level of each turn. (Microanalysis data will not be included in this report due to space constraints, but interpretations that resulted from this data are summarized and presented.) Cross transcript comparison, second opinions, cultural informants, and alternative theoretical orientations were utilized in the interpretative process.

Description and Interpretation of Data

The remainder of this report will concentrate on the presentation of data related to the four research questions presented earlier. A description of the dominant ideology of bilingualism and related practices are presented first in order to provide a sense of the general meaning and value of bilingualism at River Valley School. This is followed by an analysis of three individual teacher

ideologies regarding instruction for second language learners and the relationship of these ideologies to practice. The final section focuses on school-wide student placement procedures, their relationship to dominant ideologies, and their implications for second language learners.

Bilingualism and Instructional Practices at River Valley School

River Valley School was an English dominant school. The 10% of students who were dominant in a language other than English attended ESL classes. Children who were dominant in Spanish also had the option to attend Spanish TBE classes. The Spanish TBE program at the school was state mandated although participation in the program was voluntary. The goal of the program was to transition students as rapidly as possible from Spanish to English rather than to produce academically proficient bilingual students. Students received instruction in Spanish while they were learning English in the English as a Second Language and English grade-level classrooms. Spanish instruction was decreased as students' English proficiency increased. English language learners who were dominant in languages other than Spanish received ESL instruction and were provided with native language tutors when available.

Even though native language instruction was provided to English language learners through either tutors or the TBE program, the native languages were treated as stepping stones to English proficiency rather than as assets or resources to be developed. ESL students were expected to learn English, native English speakers were not expected to learn a second language although occasional Spanish language instruction was offered through a voluntary tutorial program in coordination with the local university. Overall, there was little status to being bilingual in this environment and there was no emphasis on developing bilingual proficiency for any of the students,

Of the 35 full-time teachers, there were 5 native Spanish speakers, a native Hebrew speaker, and a handful of native English speaking teachers who had a beginning to intermediate grasp of Spanish or other second language. Thus, the majority of teachers were members of the dominant White monolingual, monocultural native English speaking population at the school. For the most part, they were unaware of the local ideology devaluing of bilingualism because they were

members of the dominant population. Historical circumstances had placed them in positions of power from which they had little or no experience with second language proficiency or minority ideologies related to language. This is not to negate the efforts of individual teachers in supporting bilingualism and the positioning of bilingual students. It is to point out that power relations influence the meanings constructed for bilingualism in specific contexts.

The value of bilingualism at River Valley School was shaped in large part by the dominant monolingual, monocultural native English speaking population at the school and in the culture at large. These meanings and their related ideologies were reflected in educational practices which impacted all students. ESL students were assisted in learning English, but not supported in maintaining their native language once English proficiency had been attained. Native English speakers were sometimes encouraged, but rarely expected to learn a second language and had no pressing need to do so.

In the following section three specific teacher ideologies regarding multiculturalism, bilingualism, and related practices are presented. They represent Mrs. Ryan, the kindergarten teacher, Sra. García, the TBE teacher, and myself, the ESL teacher. This section demonstrates how the three of us were positioned very differently by both historical and current circumstances and their underlying power dynamics. This positioning shaped our ideologies and influenced practice.

Teacher Ideologies and Related Practices

Mrs. Ryan, Kindergarten Teacher

Mrs. Ryan demonstrated a deep, personal commitment to social justice and social change which was shaped by her own experience as an African American woman. She adhered to the principle of "unity through diversity." In her classroom she emphasized valuing diversity and respecting all people. She was committed to teaching social studies topics related to diversity and multicultural education and had graduate training in these areas. She focused on both the differences and similarities among people while she worked to build a strong sense of community

among the children and adults in her class.

She believed that there was a connection between valuing people, their cultures, and the languages they spoke. She was also aware of the dominant local discourse which did not value bilingualism or diversity. The curriculum she developed reflected the diversity of children in her classroom and included studying the native languages and cultural backgrounds of her students, purchasing and displaying bilingual materials in the classroom, inviting parents for visits and presentations, and writing and performing a Spanish/English bilingual play. She also conducted many class meetings which revolved around children's interests and concerns during which children's contributions were honored with respect.

Mrs. Ryan stated that although she recognized the need to prepare children for academic success, she believed the social issues and social relationships had equal significance for children's investment and success in school. She also believed that respect and interpersonal relationships were the key to achieving her vision of a harmonious and just society. If people truly cared about each other across boundaries such as race, culture, ethnicity, gender, age, language, and religion then social change was possible. Mrs. Ryan worked constantly to increase the number and variety of relationships that her students had with each other and with other children and adults in the school. At faculty meetings she challenged all teachers to examine the diversity of their personal relationships and believed that we all had a responsibility to expand our personal and professional relationships beyond our own racial, linguistic, and religious affiliations.

She also believed that developing relationships required time and consistent contact among different people. This was one of her frustrations with pull-out programs. She felt that they separated children and reduced their opportunities to make friends and integrate into the grade-level classroom. She questioned how the pull-out ESL/TBE program model employed in this particular setting affected her vision of unity. Like most mainstream classroom teachers, she wanted her ESL/TBE students to learn English and felt this was crucial for their ultimate success. At the same time she did not want them to feel negatively about speaking their first languages. She did not want

being bilingual to be interpreted as being "less than" or indicating a problem. She was very concerned that separating the second language learners by language when they left to attend ESL and TBE classes also separated them by race.

This racial segregation was counter to everything that she believed in. As an African American woman Mrs. Ryan was keenly aware of the historical context of racial issues between Blacks and Whites in the United States and the underlying inequitable distribution of power. Torn from their country, cultures, and languages nearly 400 years ago, Africans and African Americans have suffered slavery, racism, segregation, discrimination, and inequality in the United States (Zinn, 1980). The last thing Mrs. Ryan wanted to do was to endorse the separation and segregation of the English language learners from the native English speakers.

Mrs. Ryan felt caught between her deep commitment to create a prejudice free, harmonious society and her desire to honor the needs of her bilingual students. From her perspective, the ESL/TBE model at River Valley Elementary in some ways seemed to be working against her goal of unity by separating and removing students from the classroom in which she worked so hard to create a sense of community. She expressed this feeling of conflict during an interview when she described classroom and school-wide practices related to the instruction of ESL/TBE students:

> . . . in terms of the language I'm just not sure whether the way we're doing what we're doing is the best way for what we're doing. I don't feel positively or negatively. . . . I'm not sure. I know we need this mix, but how we're doing it, I'm just not sure. I need to see these kids go on to first grade and be just as successful as any other class before I'll say, "Okay, maybe that's the way to do it." I know we want to value their language and culture, but I'm just not sure yet. You know, I see the kids lining up to pull-out. . . I certainly don't want to appear racist or whatever, you know. I don't know enough about languages and all that stuff to say, "Oh, yes, this is the best way." But I did have a conversation with a person who has written a couple of books about this and it was their feeling there are other ways to do it.
>
> (Interview #1, p.5).

This sentiment sometimes created a tension between herself and the ESL and TBE teachers when it came to removing the children from the classroom for instruction or grouping them for Spanish translation. Her priority was unity and she resisted separation.

Sra. García, Spanish TBE Teacher

Sra. García, the Spanish TBE teacher, was also concerned about the TBE students' academic achievement, social integration, and feelings of value and acceptance in the mainstream classrooms. She held a slightly different perspective on these issues than Mrs. Ryan due, in part, to differing historical circumstances.

Sra. García was one of three TBE teachers who worked in the TBE program during the 10 years of its existence. All three of the women who had taught in the program were experienced teachers certified in bilingual education with master's degrees. All three were native Spanish speakers from Puerto Rico with professional proficiency in Spanish and English. And, although the three teachers worked in the program at different periods of its development, in different spaces, and with different children, they shared very similar views about the priorities of the program and the climate in which they worked. I believe that their common Puerto Rican heritage, as well as their experience as bilingual teachers in this particular monolingual environment, shaped their perceptions, beliefs, and practices. Therefore, I will draw on their ideologies as a group since they were so similar.

All three teachers saw their role as providing academic as well as emotional and cultural support to their students. They all believed that their students had a right to receive instruction in Spanish. It was this native language component of the program that guaranteed access to an equitable education. While the TBE teachers were concerned about their students' social integration into the mainstream program and culture, they were adamant about the benefits of separating their students from the mainstream population in order to provide Spanish instruction. In addition to academic support, the TBE teachers felt the affirmation of language and culture that occurred in the TBE program was a vital component of their students' success. Without native language instruction, their students would not be able to access the curriculum. In order to survive in an English dominant environment, the TBE teachers believed that their students needed a strong grasp of their native language and a solid sense of their own cultural identity, something that they, as

Latina teachers, could provide. The TBE teachers understood what it was like to exist in a context where bilingualism and biculturalism were not highly valued (Nieto & Rolón, 1997). They were intent on creating a strong sense of community and relationships among the Latino children in the school. They also provided a vital link between Spanish dominant parents and the school and often encountered parents of their students in social situatuions.

The TBE teachers were concerned that some of the classroom teachers did not seem to understand the goals of bilingual education and viewed the TBE program as something separate, remedial, or adjunct to the English program. In addition to advocating for the program, they also had to advocate for equitable distribution of resources and services in order to provide equitable instruction to their students, something they all reported and, at times, resented.

The TBE teachers all worked toward harmonious relationships with mainstream classroom teachers but felt that some of the classroom teachers did not respect the fact that they planned and taught lessons and were, in fact, teachers. Sometimes, for example, grade-level classroom teachers changed the schedule or planned an unannounced event which affected the TBE teachers' plans and lessons. The TBE teachers felt highly responsible for the academic achievement and cultural support of their students and were concerned when they had to give up instructional time to unplanned interruptions. They also felt that their instructional time was not valued or respected when classroom teachers did not consult them about schedule changes.

All of the TBE teachers provided the majority of instruction within their own classroom but were open, on some occasions, to working in mainstream classes or assigning their bilingual aide to work in mainstream classes. However, the TBE teachers reported that the TBE students did not focus well when English instruction and subsequent Spanish translation was provided as was the case in English mainstream classrooms, a finding also reported by Wong Fillmore (1982). When TBE teachers attempted to work with both English and Spanish dominant children in the classroom, in order to encourage social integration, they found that this compromised the instruction for the TBE students. It also had implications for the TBE students' relationship to the

TBE teacher. Sra. García describes her experience trying to teach a math group comprised of TBE students and native English speakers:

> Well, you know, sometimes I would really lose some of my kids when I spoke English to the English speaking kids. So I really had to stick with speaking Spanish only, otherwise they would just lose interest and think that at that moment they were not required to do any work or pay attention because it was, they, they don't see me as a person who speaks English. So as soon as I spoke English, there was no connection between us.
>
> (Interview #1, p. 2.)

Without Spanish instruction, the TBE children did not have access to the lessons so Sra. García abandoned mixed group instruction in mainstream classrooms in this particular instance. Working in mainstream classrooms also sometimes compromised the TBE teacher's status. If the TBE teachers felt they were not treated as teachers, but rather as translators or aides, they often opted to teach in the TBE classroom.

Just as Mrs. Ryan's emphasis on integration and social justice were related to her African American heritage and the experiences of Blacks in the United States, the TBE teachers' ideologies were due, in part, to the historical and political relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. A brief summary of this history reveals that Puerto Ricans have lived under 500 years of colonization. First under Spain for 400 years and then another 100 years under the U.S. after the Island was claimed by the United States in the Spanish-American War.

In 1989, under U.S. rule, Puerto Rico was declared an unincorporated territory subject to Congressional rule but Puerto Ricans were denied citizenship, given no access to the protection of the U.S. Constitution, and no right to vote in U.S. elections (Walsh, 1991). In 1899 English was declared the language of government and in 1905 began to replace Spanish as the language of instruction in Puerto Rican schools. U.S. mainland curriculum was imported to educate the new colony (Negrón de Montilla, 1971; Nieto, 1998; Solis, 1994). There was little effort to understand the culture, language, or lives of the Puerto Rican people. Under U.S. rule Puerto Ricans have been subjected to a stripping away of their language, their voice, their history, their livelihood, their culture, and the ability to self-govern. This process of domination did not occur without

resistance. Teachers and students resisted the imposition of English and American values in the schools and there is continued resistance to the Island's status as a Commonwealth from some political groups.

Poor economic circumstances on the Island caused by the displacement of agricultural workers by U.S. corporations, have forced many Puerto Ricans to migrate to the mainland where they are subjected to further racist attitudes from the very population that has caused their plight. For many this has had serious personal and cultural consequences.

The U.S. policies instituted on the Island were designed to meld and mold its population into colonial subservience. Thus, the debate and ideological stances over language and bilingual education must be examined within the political context of U.S. domination and colonialization:

> Through its use of the English language, its imposition of U.S. values, and its emphasis on and maintenance of a dominant/subordinate ideology, schooling in Puerto Rico has contributed to what might be termed a sort of psychological domestication; hindered have been individuals' creativity, self-confidence, and self-determination. From early childhood, students are taught that Puerto Rico is small and the United States is big, that Puerto Rico is weak and the United States is strong. Outside of the United States, Puerto Rico has no history, no heroes or heroines; Puerto Rico has never been able to stand alone. This hegemonic positioning, according to some, has perpetuated a sort of national inferiority complex, a population that is torn between their own cultural roots and histories and those of the colonizer (Walsh, 1991, p. 26).

The Puerto Rican teachers in this study were all highly educated and were aware of these historical circumstances. Their remarkably similar ideologies were not simply individually constituted, but shaped by their common experience. And while not all of the TBE children were Puerto Rican, the TBE teachers were involved in a struggle to maintain their own, and their students', sense of identity and culture as a way to resist being swallowed and annihilated by the mainstream English dominant culture that had invaded their island and permeated the school.

In contrast, many of the English dominant River Valley teachers, the majority population, were not aware of the history between Puerto Rico and the United States nor the power issues related to language, culture, and identity that were of vital importance to the Puerto Rican teachers. This ignorance was the result of participating in a dominant, less visible English monolingual, monocultural discourse of the school and culture at large and sometimes created tension between

the Puerto Rican and mainstream teachers.

Ms. Hruska, ESL Teacher

As the ESL teacher, I believed my focus should be to teach the children English and make academic work accessible. While I used my second languages for clarification in the ESL room and encouraged children to use their native languages to help each other, the focus was on learning and using English. I believed increased English proficiency would give them greater access to academic success and status within their classrooms. I also believed that by taking the children to the ESL room, I was rescuing them from the linguistic chaos and overwhelming circumstances of their mainstream classrooms where they were subjected to embarrassment and doomed to academic failure. I also believed that the ESL program gave the children greater access to comprehensible language and provided more opportunities to speak in the smaller, less threatening ESL groups than they would have had in the mainstream classroom. Furthermore, I felt that I was responsible for incorporating their native languages and cultures into the ESL lessons while also teaching them about American culture in a more direct way than would occur in mainstream classrooms.

I thought that the children would experience greater academic progress and success because they would have greater access to language and concepts in ESL class. I could create lessons and curriculum that were tailored to their needs and interests. I went to great efforts to coordinate my instruction with the topics and units that were being taught by mainstream teachers whenever feasible. If third graders were conducting dinosaur research, then we would be doing adapted dinosaur research in the ESL room. This, I believed, provided a connection to the mainstream program and a feeling of accomplishment for the ESL students.

My European-American background positioned me to believe English proficiency and academic success were the benefits I could offer my students. I assumed that this combination would give my students equal access to the education that was available to their native English speaking peers. I was less aware of the racial and cultural implications of my beliefs than Mrs. Ryan or Sra. García (Sleeter, 1993). And, while I was not aware of it at the time, I was placing

children's linguistic and academic success above their social relationships and social integration in the mainstream classroom. I had been aware of the friendships that they formed with other ESL students in the ESL class. I felt these relationships were important because the ESL children shared similar linguistic and cultural experiences. I was less informed about their relationships in other contexts.

Ideologies and Practice

The previous section has demonstrated how ideologies of language use and instruction are not simply the property of individual teachers but are the result of a much broader social contexts. Bilingual education and related practices are rooted in power relations in the United Stated:

> In order to understand the dialectics of linguistic imposition and linguistic resistance, it is important to situate language in history, in experience, and in the relations of power and struggle that determine, legitimize, and/or constrain particular ways of being. . . . It is through language that individuals fashion a ". . . voice that is rooted in their collective history, struggles, and lived experience, and in their relation to one another, to society and to the ideological and material forces that surround them. . . the voice or voices of individuals frequently reveal much about the conditions and relations that position and surround them (Walsh, 1991, p. 4).

Individual ideologies are not simply the result of personal beliefs, but are a reflection of how individuals are positioned in specific circumstances. Mrs. Ryan an African-American English dominant classroom teacher, Sra. García a Puerto Rican Spanish bilingual teacher, and myself an European-American native English speaking ESL teacher held beliefs that were shaped by historical circumstances, their implicit power relations, our educational training, our personal experiences, and our positions within the school. We all had the best interests of our students at heart, but supported slightly different and sometimes conflicting ideologies. Mrs. Ryan and Sra. García were both working to resist and change the dominant discourses and discriminatory practices that Blacks and Puerto Ricans suffer in the United States. They both belonged to groups that were involuntarily forced into contact with the mainstream culture (Ogbu, 1991, Sleeter, 1996). One group was removed from their homeland for slavery, the other imposed upon in the process of colonization. And yet the efforts of these two teachers resulted in sometimes contradictory practices which created tension and conflict related to language use and the location

of instruction. My position of privilege as a White native English speaker blinded me to the historical implications of power, race, and culture implicit in local practices.

The three teacher ideologies also highlighted the link between ideology and practice. The ideologies presented here were articulated for the purpose of analysis but were not always explicit during day-to-day interaction. Nevertheless, whether implicit or explicit, what teachers believe about the nature of learning, the meaning of education, their role, their responsibilities, and the balance of academic and social issues impacts practice and has implications for second language learners in all contexts.

A New Perspective

During the course of conducting research, I spent a year observing in Mrs. Ryan's classroom. These observations raised my awareness of the significance of the children's social relationships. Even though I had six years of classroom teaching experience, I had shifted my emphasis to a focus on language learning and academic achievement. I was shocked to see how much of the children's time and energy went into creating and affirming friendships within the context of their mainstream classrooms. These friendships in turn had implications for the children's access to interaction, language, learning, social status, and positive identities (Hruska, 1999).

Additional observations in the TBE classroom revealed the strong sense of community that was emphasized there. The TBE teachers used a different style of interaction than mainstream teachers and the children responded favorably. The students obviously adored the TBE teachers and operated almost as a large family with a mixture of ages and grades all working and playing together. They focused on helping each other and including everyone in discussions and activities. Their interconnection and comfort with each other made an impression on me, as did the intimacy of their relationship with their Latina teachers (Nieto & Rolón).

I began to see the value of both the mainstream classroom and the TBE classroom in a new way. The classroom teacher worked in one setting toward unity through diversity with the

entire classroom population where children were busy creating relationships that were relevant during every part of every day. I also observed the TBE teacher, in the midst of a context which did not understand or value bilingual education and biculturalism, strengthening her students' sense of cultural identity as a group across grade levels. In my role as ESL teacher in yet a third context, I was providing access to English, an important tool for success. All of us were committed to our students and our beliefs. Each environment was geared toward creating a community, but the related practices sometimes resulted in tension and conflict because the children were physically different places building different relationships and identities.

Cummins (1996) believes that relationships and identities have the potential to keep students in school: ". . . human relationships are at the heart of schooling. The interactions that take place between students and teachers and among students are more central to student success than any method for teaching literacy, or science or math" (p. 1) and have fundamental consequences for students' success. This message is endorsed by Genesee (1994) who states that "Educating second language children has been kept separate from issues concerning their social integration in mainstream classrooms and the school at large" (p. 2). His position is that academics are not enough, attention to social integration is critical.

The question then became, how to best meet the linguistic, academic, cultural, and social needs of the second language learners when current practices appeared to be in conflict. The answer to this question will vary from site to site, depending on the context and population. In this case, there were three components of the children's academic program to consider, the grade-level program, the TBE program, and the ESL program. For Latino students, the TBE program provided a vital link to language, culture, and academics. Latino students have the highest drop-out rate in the state and there is evidence which suggests that students who receive bilingual education, even transitional programs such as the one at River Valley Elementary, are more likely to succeed (Frau-Ramos & Nieto, 1993; Nieto, 1992). It is also my personal experience that the bilingual program at our school has significantly improved the Spanish bilingual children's academic

achievement. ESL classes, another component, were designed to meet students' English language needs so that they wouldn't be left stranded without access to the mainstream English curriculum. However, the children's social relationships and social integration into the mainstream classroom were also important and required attention.

Wanting to honor all three components, I concluded that the ESL program could become more flexible in accommodating students' academic, social, and linguistic needs. While I had worked to foster children's relationships and create a sense of community within the ESL room, I could see that greater coordination with the mainstream program would benefit the children. They would have a less fragmented day and would be more coordinated and integrated into their grade-level classrooms. As a result, I made changes in the ESL program during the initial year of the study.

To increase the ESL students' contact time with mainstream children while not compromising their ESL instruction, I began allowing children of all grade levels to bring mainstream friends to ESL class. In one first grade, all the children in the class spent one to two weeks in ESL, as part of writing workshop. In other cases I negotiated the schedule with teachers who wanted to have their entire class, including the ESL students, together at predictable times each week. I also spent more time with the children in the kindergarten classroom during ESL time instead of taking the children to the ESL room.

The fact that all of the kindergarteners were in one room was an important feature in facilitating greater coordination between the ESL and mainstream program. One reason that ESL instruction had traditionally occurred in the ESL room was due to the constraint of scheduling children across seven grade levels from 20 different classrooms. Given that the district allotted funding for only one ESL teacher at River Valley School for 30-40 ESL students grades K-6, it was necessary to combine classrooms and grade levels in order to meet with every student and every grade level everyday.

I began to investigate the possibility of implementing a clustering model at River Valley School. This would involve grouping or "clustering" the ESL students in mainstream classrooms as the kindergarteners had been. For example, instead of distributing six ESL/TBE second graders across the three second grade classrooms, all six would be placed in the same room. This would increase the possibility of working more closely with the mainstream program and had the potential to defragment the children's day. Grouping the ESL children would also make their presence more apparent in the classroom which would require that instruction be geared to their needs. As a group, they might receive more attention than one or two students in isolation. It would also provide the children with a peer group within their classroom, greater academic support from these peers, and potentially greater status.

I contacted TBE and ESL teachers both within and outside of the district who had experience with a clustering model and providing instruction in mainstream classrooms. They gave very favorable reports about increased coordination with mainstream programs and increased contact time between mainstream and ESL students. They also felt that they were able to model appropriate instructional language and strategies for working with second language learners when they were in the mainstream classrooms. I also attended a meeting for a collaborative project between River Valley teachers, TBE parents, and the local university. The purpose of this collaboration was to focus on the needs of the Latino population at River Valley School. This group was in favor of grouping the TBE students in order to increase their sense of belonging and to provide peer support in their mainstream classrooms. I attended a racism course which helped me to begin to understand and articulate the relationship between privilege, power, and practice. I also spoke informally with River Valley teachers, parents, and administrators who were open to the possibility of a clustering model. Encouraged by these findings, I decided to move forward.

Between gathering data for the original study and conducting the follow-up study, Sra. García left the school and was replaced by Sra. Valdez. Sra. Valdez was been very much in favor of clustering, recognized its advantages for her students, and had wanted to try it at River Valley

School even before I had considered it. She commented, however, that as a single Latina voice, she was not heard or understood when suggesting a practice that was in conflict with dominant practices and ideologies. I became interested in clustering only after conducting research which helped me to see how the practices and ideologies operating at the site were primarily serving mainstream children. It was not readily apparent to me at first as a member of the dominant population. Once I realized the potential of the model, I was able to work in collaboration Sra. Valdez to present the concept to the faculty. However, in the midst of this process, Sra. Valdez, unexpectedly left the school and was not immediately replaced, which is why I sometimes refer only to my own participation, perceptions, and interpretation of the process.

Challenging Dominant Practices

After receiving approval from the building administrator, Sra. Valdez and I drew up a proposal and formally presented it to the River Valley faculty. The proposal stated that clustering did not imply a change of instruction, pull-out instruction could still occur, but the possibility for inclusion (ESL or TBE in the classroom) or greater coordination with mainstream classroom units and projects would be possible. The purpose of this presentation to the faculty was to seek out one or two teachers who might be interested in piloting the clustering model in their classrooms the following year.

Initial teacher responses fell along a continuum. At one end were a few teachers who volunteered immediately to pilot the model in their classrooms. These teachers either had positive prior experience with such a model, or could clearly articulate their reasons for wanting to do so. At the other end of the continuum were a few teachers who did not favor the idea. They felt it would create"imbalanced" classes in terms of English language proficiency and race. They feared that it would segregate the bilingual children and impede their social integration into the mainstream population. The rest of the teachers fell in between, interested, but wanting more information.

Parents were not formally involved in the decision to cluster and do not typically have input into student placement at River Valley School. However, during parent conferences, I informally questioned bilingual parents all of whom were in favor of the model. They were concerned about the fragmented nature of their children's day and supported the idea that their children would be more connected to the mainstream classroom and be placed with their Spanish speaking peers. Parental complaints to date, regarding the clustering model, have come only from an English dominant family who saw the practice as racial segregation. They felt that it was discriminatory to purposely group all of the Latino children together.

In the end, the option to cluster at any given grade level was considered by the teachers at that grade. They discussed whether anyone on their team was interested in participating and considered the nature of the student population at that grade level and the appropriateness of clustering. This process was not without tension, but in this case the pilot year did include clustered classrooms at five out of seven grade levels. In cases where more than one teacher per grade level wanted to pilot the program, the grade level team decided amongst themselves who would be the designated teacher. Classroom teachers always reserved the right not to cluster if they felt it was inappropriate for a specific group of children.

An important aspect of the clustering model, is that it prioritized the needs of ESL/TBE students. This challenged some dominant practices and underlying ideologies that were operating school-wide regarding student placement procedures. For, although the clustering was voluntary and only interested teachers would participate, clustering required changing these placement procedures which affected everyone. Traditional placement procedures and the conflicts and tensions that surfaced as a result of challenging this practice are presented next.

Student Placement and Teacher Reactions

Student placement typically occurred in late spring for the following year. Each grade level team met and created the classes that would be forwarded to the next grade level. Previously, this procedure had been based on the concept of "balance" and an equal distribution of students across

the grade level. The criteria generally used in this process were: numbers of students, gender, race, class, academic performance, behavior, demand on teacher time, personality, special education needs, and ESL/TBE needs. In addition, most classroom teachers attempted to place children in a class with at least one friend. The goal was to make each class as similar as possible. In the process, it also distributed and potentially isolated the ESL/TBE students, and other minority groupings which was not always to their advantage. Clustering the ESL/TBE students on the other hand prioritized their needs. It also challenged a model which had previously privileged white native English speaking students and teachers.

Changing the equal distribution practice raised several issues. Many of these concerns were related to teachers' fears of change or loss of control. The most prevalent concern involved the notion that clustering would result in "too many" TBE students in one classroom. Although how many would be too many was never defined, there would not have been more than seven in any room due to the distribution of ESL/TBE students across the school. The fear was that it would be too difficult to teach if there were "too many" second language learners. This fear highlighted the fact that these students would become more visible and their needs more difficult to overlook. Some teachers felt insecure about providing these services. Others were concerned that if instruction were adapted to meet the needs of second language learners it might come at the expense of native English speakers. Native English speaking students often came from families that were familiar with the school system and were more willing and able to advocate for the needs of their children. In contrast, most of the Latino parents came from different class and language backgrounds. Many had limited English proficiency and were struggling financially, working long hours at low paying jobs. They were also from a culture which respected the school and trusted the teachers to do what was best for their children. Latino parents were much less likely than mainstream parents to put pressure on the school to ensure that their children's needs were indeed being met (Sleeter, 1996). Although this was never overtly articulated by mainstream teachers, it may have been a factor in their resistance to clustering. TBE teachers on the other hand, felt that

they were often in the position of having to advocate for their students' parents who were unlikely to do it for themselves. They often felt like lone voices in the wind and believed that their students' needs were not always met as a result.

A second prevalent objection was that clustering would place most of the bilingual children in one room leaving the classrooms at that grade level less linguistically and racially diverse. Some teachers were concerned that this would deny the monolingual, largely white population a multicultural experience. Other teachers did not want to be denied the opportunity to have second language learners in their classrooms because they enjoyed these students themselves. However, providing mainstream students with a multicultural experience at the expense of the TBE/ESL students who become separated and isolated, privileges an already privileged population. Who is privileged by dominant practices usually relates to power. In this case, multiculturalism and equity were defined as giving the dominant population "equal" exposure to minority cultures rather then prioritizing the needs of the minority children.

Because the majority of the ESL children spoke Spanish, another concern was that if the Latino children were placed together in mainstream classrooms, it would only reinforce their tendency to stick together. This was less of a concern for children who were dominant in a language other than Spanish. By separating the Latino children some teachers felt they would be more likely to make friends with mainstream children, learn more English, and operate as less of an insulated group. The TBE teachers did not see the benefits of separating their students from each other and preventing them from having the linguistic, academic, cultural, and social support of their Latino peers. Separating them did not mean they would be more academically and socially successful only more isolated. They did not feel it was the responsibility of their students to racially or linguistically diversify classrooms at their own expense. They felt that they drew strength in their identities as Latino children by being together (Tatum, 1997).

In support of clustering, one classroom teacher reported that when she did have higher numbers of TBE students in her classroom the children had a greater presence and greater influence

on classroom affairs. They drew strength from being together, were more comfortable in the classroom, had more status and were actually more successful at forming relationships with mainstream peers as they moved from a place of confidence and security within their Latino peer group. The teacher also reported that she concentrated more on incorporating Spanish and Spanish literature into classroom instruction which benefitted all of the children.

Teachers also feared that if they had more ESL/TBE students in their classrooms and were more closely coordinated with the TBE and ESL programs, they would lose control of their schedules and the freedom to be spontaneous and flexible. With the TBE children sprinkled among the two or three grade level classrooms, the mainstream teachers often changed their plans and schedules without consulting the ESL or TBE teachers. Having more children would require closer coordination and greater respect for the ESL/TBE teachers' time and plans. This felt constraining to some classroom teachers who preferred more independence and autonomy in scheduling.

Teachers pointed out that increased coordination with the ESL/TBE teachers would require an investment in planning time and negotiation of authority. The need for planning time was realistic if coordination between the mainstream and ESL/TBE programs was increased. This is why clustering was done on a volunteer basis only. The amount of planning would depend on how closely the programs would be coordinated and if instruction would remain pull-out or shift to inclusion. Many teachers were quite willing to have the ESL or TBE teacher in their classrooms as an extra pair of hands, more in the role as an aide, following the classroom teacher's lead. They were less willing to negotiate their authority with these teachers or invest the time that it might require to equalize their roles in the classroom or consider their input into curriculum and instruction. This was an issue for me as well. If I was going to be open to providing some ESL instruction in mainstream classrooms, I too, would have to invest time in planning and negotiating roles. I was concerned about being able to maintain my status as a teacher and still develop strong relationships with the children if I were not the teacher in my own space. In the past, when I had worked in mainstream classrooms, it required a great deal of coordination and communication

between mainstream teachers and myself to plan and implement lessons. If lessons were not co-planned I often got relegated to the status of an aide supporting the classroom teacher. Sometimes I was asked to conduct or complete a lesson when the goals and expectations of the lesson had not been clearly articulated by the classroom teacher. Sometimes I was asked to lead a group in an activity that was not appropriate for ESL learners at that level. Sometimes I was unable to implement the positive management system that I used in my own classroom because it either conflicted with the teacher's management system, or because I did not have the authority in another teacher's classroom to be effective. It became challenging to develop positive teacher-student relationships with children under these circumstances and ensure appropriate instruction. Planning time and teacher roles were issues that would need to be negotiated if there were greater coordination among programs.

Curriculum and materials were also an issue. While the ESL program could use many of the mainstream materials, the TBE teachers needed equivalent materials in Spanish. When new math and reading series were adopted for mainstream classes, parallel materials were not purchased for the bilingual program. These materials had not been put in the budget and were viewed as "extra." This left the TBE teachers having to scramble to either translate, create, or purchase materials from their personal funds. Few mainstream teachers were aware of this problem. But those who had attempted to coordinate math instruction with the TBE program in the past had discovered that the TBE children were not even using the same math series because it was unavailable to them. This made coordination very difficult. The inequitable distribution of materials related to an inequitable distribution of power, suddenly became an issue for mainstream teachers if they were going to be working more closely with TBE students and teachers.

Two final incidents which were also the result of power relations occurred once the clustering classrooms had been identified and placement was under way. In past years, because students were equally distributed among the grade level classrooms, teachers had less control about who was coming into their rooms but more control about where to place the children the following

year. Each of these issues came up in the course of clustering the bilingual students.

In one case, the receiving grade did not want to cluster because of the concern that clustering the children would amount to segregation and create a "brown class" of children. The danger, they felt, was that this class would come to be viewed as different and inferior. One member of this team also preferred to have some, but not all of the ESL students in her classroom. However, a teacher from the sending grade level was adamant about keeping this particular group of TBE children together. They had been together for two years and had formed strong friendships. They had had a very successful year both academically and socially in her classroom. She felt so strongly about keeping them together she claimed that to ". . . separate them would be like cutting off my arm or dividing the children in half. For them to look out and see only one or no brown faces in their classrooms would be cruel." This teacher refused to split the group and threatened to go the building principal if necessary. Thus, the receiving team did not feel like they had a choice in the matter even though they did not fully endorse it.

In the second scenario, the sending grade level was the team that did not approve of clustering. In this case the three sending teachers were resisting placing seven ESL students, six of whom were girls, in one classroom. They felt they were losing control of where they could place all of the students because they were having to work around the ESL/TBE students. They felt the model was compromising too many children. For example, placing the ESL/TBE students together limited who else could be placed with them and separated some sets of friends. The sending team also felt that they were unable to place particular second language learners with particular teachers if all the ESL/ TBE children were clustered with one teacher. Another issue this team was grappling with was gender. Since the majority of the second language learners were girls, putting them in one room limited the number of English speaking girls that could be placed in that room with them. This was a problem because their mainstream friends could not be with them and most of the girls in the classroom would be second language learners receiving either ESL and/or TBE services. If they left the room for these services, there would be mostly boys left behind. If they

stayed, instructional groups might be gender divided. When one teacher suggested a classroom composed entirely of girls, the other teachers quickly protested in unison as this created an imbalance of boys in the other rooms. It was interesting to note that none of the teachers complained about having too many girls, but all were resistant to having an abundance of boys. The implicit message might have been that boys were more difficult to manage if there weren't enough girls in the classroom to dilute their presence and the power that males wield in this culture. Because the receiving grade in this case was committed to piloting the clustering model, the sending team did group the children in one class, expressing strong reservations.

Summary

Grouping, placement procedures, and instructional practices at River Valley School had traditionally catered to a White, native English speaking population. Prioritizing the needs of second language learners challenged dominant practices, their underlying ideologies, and revealed issues of power. This included the meaning and value of bilingualism at the local site as measured by the types of programs that were available to both ESL and native English speakers. It also included the tensions that arose when considering clustering ESL/TBE students. Many teachers felt they were at risk for losing control of placement, scheduling, planning, instruction, materials, and authority. They were nervous about White parent reactions and the implications of the changes for the dominant population. Other teachers were concerned about potential negative implications for the bilingual students and resisted clustering on the basis that it was too reminiscent of segregation and tracking which smacked of discrimination.

Conclusion

The purpose of this report has not been to argue that clustering is a preferred or best practice, nor is it necessarily relevant and suitable to all contexts. Given the numbers of ESL/TBE students and the available resources in terms of teachers, time, money, and materials clustering seemed to be one way in which to address the linguistic, academic, cultural, and social needs of the second language learners at River Valley School. What I have tried to demonstrate is how

ideologies are shaped by power relations and expressed through language, how ideologies and practice are related, and how tensions can arise when dominant ideologies are made explicit and dominant practices are challenged in specific sites. In the process of prioritizing the needs of second language learners at River Valley School, issues of power and control were brought to the surface. This led to a re-examination of the ESL pull-out model of instruction. It challenged traditional placement procedures which privileged the native English speaking population by replacing the traditional equal distribution of students across classrooms to a model in which second language learners were purposefully grouped. This grouping will potentially require a renegotiation of teacher roles and relationships if ESL, TBE, and classroom teachers choose to collaborate more closely in the interests of their students school experience and school success. While these particular issues may not be directly relevant to all educational settings, the questions that framed this research are: What are the dominant ideologies in any setting? What are the related practices? Whom do they serve?

References

Cummins, J. (1996). Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society. Ontario, CA: California Association of Bilingual Education.

Delpit, L. (1995). Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom. New York: The New Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and power. New York: Longman.

Frau-Ramos, M., & Nieto, S. (1993). I was an outsider: An exploratory study of dropping out among Puerto Rican youths in Holyoke, Massachusetts. In R. Rivera & S. Nieto (Eds.), The education of Latino students in Massachusetts: Issues, research, and policy implications (pp. 147-169). Boston: The Mauricio Gastón Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy, University of Massachusetts.

Genesee, F. (Ed.). (1994). Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Glick, J. (1987). Bilingualism: Cognitive and social aspects. In P. Homel, M. Palij, & D. Aaronson (Eds.), Childhood bilingualism: Aspects of linguistic, cognitive, and social development (pp. 171-179). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Hruska, B. (1999). Bilingualism, Gender, and Friendship: Constructing Second Language Learners in a Mainstream Kindergarten. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Martin-Jones, M. & Heller, M. (1996). Introduction to the special issues on education in multilingual settings: Discourse, identities, and power. Linguistics and Education, 8, 3-16.

Negrón De Montilla, A. (1971). Americanization of Puerto Rico and the public school system 1900-1930. Rio Piedras, PR: Editorial Edil.

Nieto, S. (1990). Fact and fiction: Stories of Puerto Ricans in U.S. schools. Harvard Educational Review, 68(2), 133-162.

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education. New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (1999). The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities.New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Nieto, S. & Rolón, C. (1997). Preparation and professional development of teachers: A perspective from two Latinas. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners (pp.89-123). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Ogbu, J. U. (1991). Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective. In M.A. Gibson, & J. U. Ogbu (Eds.), Minority status and schooling (pp. 3-33). New York: Garland.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sleeter, C. E. (1996). Multilateral Education as Social Activism. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Solis, J. (1994). Public school reform in Puerto Rico; Sustaining colonial models of development. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Spradley, J. J. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Tatum, Beverly. (1997). "Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?". New York: Basic Books.

Taylor, D. M. (1987). Social psychological barriers to effective childhood bilingualism. In P. Homel, M. Palij, & D. Aaronson (Eds.), Childhood bilingualism: Aspects of linguistic cognitive, and social development (pp. 183-195). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Walsh, C. E. (1991). Pedagogy and the struggle for voice: Issues of language power and schooling for Puerto Ricans. New York: Bergin and Garvey.Associates.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1982). Instructional language as linguistic input: Second language learning in classrooms. In L. C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in the classroom (pp. 283-296). New York: Academic Press.